GILAR KARIMI*

HOW DO PRODUCTIVE SKILLS OF L2 LEARNING REQUIRE EI?

1. INTRODUCTION

It is believed that Intelligence Quotient (IQ) is no longer considered as the best predictor of professional success. Through his studies on Emotional Intelligence (EI), D. Goleman (1995) discusses a series of connected concepts which may help us to find the reason why L2 learners are motivated. His discussion goes as follows, „the emotional mind is far quicker than the rational mind, springing into action without pausing even a moment to consider what it is doing. Its quickness precludes the deliberate, analytic reflection that is the hallmark of the thinking mind" (Goleman 1995, p. 47). In fact, Goleman's definition of EI is as follows: „Emotional intelligence consists of knowing what you are feeling, recognizing what others are feeling, managing the feelings in relationships, and using your feelings to motivate yourself – even in the face of frustrations" (Goleman 1995, p. 43).

2. BACKGROUND

It is assumed that academic ability is not the only predictor of educational achievement, and that EI has a very important effect on learning. The following theoretical approaches have guided current lines of research. In an experimental study, R. Pishghadam (2009) determined the impact of emotional and verbal intelligences on English language learning success in Iran. To fully understand the nature of learning, he calculated and analyzed both the product and the process data. The results of the product-based phase demonstrated that the EI is instrumental in learning different skills, specifically productive ones. In the process-based phase, the analyses of oral and written modes of language exhibited the effects of emotional and verbal intelligences on turn-taking, amount of communication, the number of errors, and writing ability.

* **Gilar Karimi Mojaveri**: M.A. in TEFL, lecturer at the Islamic Azad University, Sari Branch. She is mainly interested in psycholinguistics and teaching methodology, and has already published and presented several articles in various conferences and journals.

DACOROMANIA, serie nouă, XVII, 2012, nr. 2, p. 163–174

3. WRITING

Writing is considered as a productive skill. It involves the development and presentation of thoughts in a structured way and written mode. J. Langan (2001) defined writing as „a process that involves discovering a thesis, supporting it, organizing thoughts for the first draft, revising and editing the final one” (p. 113). Writing is the process that includes several subcomponents. EFL teachers of writing should use different strategies to encourage their learners to do their best and generate acceptable writing products.

4. EFFECTS OF EI ON EFL

English is considered an EFL to Iranians; because it is spoken only in English classes. In Iran, students, before getting into university, study General English for eight years in schools and then pursue their English studies in ESP courses at the university. It is prestigious to learn English in Iran and to acquire a native-like accent, for people put more premiums on learning English. Besides, many jobs in Iran require a good command of English.

Due to the aforementioned reasons, English language teachers in Iran are perfectionists, demanding the correct use of the language, putting much pressure on L2 learners to apply English accurately and appropriately. English classes generally create a kind of threatening environment in Iran; students’ errors are corrected immediately in a direct way.

Therefore, it seems to be natural that emotional factors, especially intrapersonal competencies and stress management abilities, can be of great importance in this context of learning.

Using emotions or facilitating thought entails how an individual’s thoughts and other cognitive activities are informed by his or her experience of emotions. It involves prioritizing thinking by directing attention to important information. It is the ability to generate, use, and feel emotions necessary to communicate feelings or employ them in other cognitive processes.

5. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to focus on the significance of EI in teaching and learning the English language, which is also a determining factor for life success and personal development of people in general. As a result, the would-be-teachers will be trained more efficiently to be a real mentor of their students and contribute to their academic achievements in learning English.

It is hoped that the present study would pave the way for a brighter academic tomorrow of L2 learners, teachers, and syllabus designers through more productive circumstances resulted by the focus on the importance of EI. In fact, this study is probably significant in the sense that it shows if EI is a main factor that affects

performance in EFL writing. If the results indicate that such an effect exists, and if the effect size is large, this study will have implications for teachers of writing as well as materials developers.

Moreover, the results would show at which proficiency level EI leaves its greatest influence. This would also tell teachers of writing and educators at what time and proficiency level and to what extent to consider EI in their teaching programs. However, if the research would result in a negative relation between EI and writing achievement of L2 learners, care should be exercised do that less EI be included.

6. METHOD

6.1. PARTICIPANTS

The study involved two groups of participants, each consisting of at least 40 people (N = 92). The female sample consisted of 46 participants (n = 46), and the males sample included no less than this (n = 46). The participants, aged 19–25, were randomly selected and assigned to groups. They included BA students, who were all sophomores, juniors, or seniors majoring English Literature at the University of Mazandaran.

6.2. MATERIALS

The participants took a proficiency test such as OPT (Dave Allen, 1992) to check their homogeneity and proficiency level. The valid EI questionnaire named Assessing Emotions Scale (SSEIT) developed by N. S. Schutte *et alii* (1998) and was used to identify the participants' EI scores. This questionnaire is a one-factor scale, consisting of 33 items and scores from 33 to 165. The higher the score, the higher the EI.

Two writing topics were given: one with an argumentative rhetorical organization, and one with an expository rhetorical organization. The expository essay focused on „the qualities of a workable mutual life". The argumentative essay focused on the writers' views about „stress management". The passages consisted of between 800 and 900 words.

6.3. PROCEDURE

The OPT was given to 46 male and 46 female BA students of English Literature in one administration. Then, based on their English proficiency, the purposive sampling selection was done. Afterwards, the EI test was given to them to estimate their *EQ*, which is the quotient of their EI, to have a rather objective evaluation of their EI.

Their scores on this test were obtained and submitted to SPSS for a descriptive analysis. Based on their scores on the OPT, the participants were classified into two proficiency groups of less-proficient and more-proficient. The Assessing Emotions Scale (SSEIT), which was a 33-item self-report inventory focusing on typical emotional intelligence, was also administered and were submitted to a descriptive analysis in SPSS.

The participants also wrote two essays on the topics identified above. Three raters rated their products using the multiple-trait scoring scheme developed by K. Hyland (2003). Their scores were totaled and averaged. The average was then used as the raw data. As such, two sets of writing scores were obtained: one for the expository task, and one for the argumentative one.

7. RESULTS

7.1. THE RESULTS OF THE OPT TEST

As mentioned before, the participants were randomly selected from among sophomores, juniors, and seniors of B.A. in English Literature at the University of Mazandaran. They took the OPT. Based on its scores, they were classified into two proficiency groups of less-proficient and more-proficient. Afterwards, the scores were submitted to the SPSS software for the data analysis. The results of OPT, based on which the participants were distributed, are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

The OPT Results and Distribution of the Participants

Groups	*N*	Mean	Std. Deviation
Less-Proficient	48	59.42	6.19
More-Proficient	44	78.14	5.77
Total	92	68.37	11.13

As shown in Table 1, the participants were assigned into two separate groups. Group 1 consisted of 48 participants, with a mean of 59.42 and a standard deviation of 6.19. However, Group 2 included 44 learners of a higher mean (M = 78.14) and a standard deviation of 5.77. Group 1 and Group 2 were then regarded as the less-proficient and more-proficient groups respectively.

The participants were given the EI test, to have their EI scores assessed. It consisted of 33 items with a range of responses from 1 to 5. The scores ranged from 33 to 165. Items 5, 28, and 33 were scored reversely from 5 to 1, to make sure that respondents read the items carefully.

Table 2

The SSEIT Results

Groups	*N*	Mean	Std. Deviation
Less-Proficient	48	122.42	11.75
More-Proficient	44	136.57	6.47
Total	92	129.18	11.90

As shown in Table 2, the less-proficient group had lower scores, with a mean of 122.42, and a standard deviation of 11.75. On the other hand, the whole more-proficient group enjoyed higher scores with a mean of 136.57 and a standard deviation of 6.47. Totally, the mean of the two groups was 129.18. In fact, the results showed that more-proficient L2 learners of the study were more emotionally intelligent, and the less-proficient ones were less emotionally intelligent one.

7.2. THE RESULTS OF THE WRITING TESTS

7.2.1. The Expository Writing Test Results

As for the results of the expository test, the less-proficient group's mean score was 30.75 (out of 48) and they had a standard deviation of 4.10. On the other hand, the more-proficient participants got higher scores with a mean of 34.68 and a standard deviation of 5.71. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

The Expository Writing Test Results

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Less-Proficient	48	30.75	4.10
More-Proficient	44	34.68	5.71
Total	92	32.63	5.29

7.2.2. The Argumentative Writing Test Results

Another writing test that was given to the participants had argumentative organization. The less-proficient group had lower scores with a mean of 34.25, in comparison with the more-proficient ones who scored higher with a mean of 35.36.

Besides, Group 1 had a standard deviation of 4.72. Furthermore, the standard deviation of Group 2 was 6.42.

Table 4

The Results of the Argumentative Writing Test

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Less-Proficient	44	34.25	4.72
More-Proficient	48	35.36	6.42
Total	92	34.78	5.60

7.3. THE RESULTS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LESS-PROFICIENT GROUP'S EI AND EXPOSITORY WRITING

The first research question of the study was formulated to determine if there was any significant relationship between less-proficient Iranian L2 learners' EI and expository writing scores. For that purpose, the scores were obtained and statistically analyzed, using the Pearson Product Moment correlation. The results indicated that there was a moderate correlation between less-proficient group's EI and their expository writing ($r = 0.49$, $N = 48$, $p < 0.01$). Table 5 shows the correlation coefficient between them.

Table 5

The Correlation Between Less-Proficient Group's Expository Writing and EI

		EI	Expository
EI	Pearson Correlation	1	.49**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.00
	N	48	48
Expository	Pearson Correlation	.49**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.
	N	48	48

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

7.4. THE RESULTS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MORE-PROFICIENT GROUP'S EI AND EXPOSITORY WRITING

The second research question dealt with finding out if there was any significant relationship between more-proficient Iranian L2 learners' EI and expository writing scores. In order to find the answer to it, the correlation coefficient between the statistical data was analyzed by Pearson correlation. The results are shown in Table 6. in which there is no significant relationship seen between them ($r = 0.14$, $N = 44$).

Table 6

The Correlation Between More-Proficient Group's EI and Expository Writing

		EI	Expository
EI	Pearson Correlation	1	.14
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.33
	N	44	44
Expository	Pearson Correlation	.14	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.33	.
	N	44	44

7.5. THE RESULTS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LESS-PROFICIENT GROUP'S EI AND ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING

In order to find the answer to the third research question of the study, Pearson correlation by SPSS was applied again to determine if there is any significant relationship between the less-proficient Iranian L2 learners' EI and argumentative writing scores.

As the results in Table 7 show, there was a moderate correlation between them ($r = 0.47$, $N = 48$, $p < 0.01$):

Table 7

The Correlation Between Less-Proficient Group's EI and Argumentative Writing

		EI	Argumentative
EI	Pearson Correlation	1	.47**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.00
	N	48	48
Argumentative	Pearson Correlation	.47**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.
	N	48	48

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

7.6. THE RESULTS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MORE-PROFICIENT GROUP'S EI AND ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING

Eventually, the current research tried to figure out if there was any relationship between the more-proficient Iranian L2 learners' EI and argumentative writing scores. Pearson correlation analysis showed that there was a moderate correlation between them ($r = 0.41$, $N = 44$, $p < 0.01$):

Table 8

The Correlation Between EI and More-Proficient Group's Argumentative Writing

		EI	Argumentative
EI	Pearson Correlation	1	.41**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.00
	N	44	44
Argumentative	Pearson Correlation	.41**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.
	N	44	44

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

8. CONCLUSION

In fact, argumentative written performance has a subjective nature. J. Weinstein (2003) argued that emotions not only involve ways of seeing an object, but also expressing one's beliefs and taking a stance. In other words, it contributes to communicating information about our internal states, desires, beliefs, and feelings. Hence, it would involve sort of negotiation, persuasion, and communication skills. This is while such skills are related to interpersonal intelligence which requires EI.

Argumentation is to be understood both as a relationship and as an act. Therefore, the audience is of pivotal role. As a matter of fact, argumentation needs purely intellectual adherence. Furthermore, it involves the inciting of action or creating a disposition to act, which in turn necessitates attention not to the faculties, but to the whole person.

J. Weinstein (2003) maintained that adequate representation of the author's ideas on paper doesn't suffice for L2 writing test. In fact, what matters more is whether the reader has understood correctly. As a result, effective communication would require the two minds, that of the author and that of the reader, to find some kind of a shared understanding. Hence, persuasion will be impossible unless the author makes all of his or her claims explicit.

Since emotions, creativity, and even care are of high importance in reasoning; S. Bolton (2007) found them relevant to the problems in argument reconstruction and the discrepancies between points of view. Consequently, argumentation should be contextual and more emotively and rhetorically concerned. As a result, efficient argumentation would tap EI. Moreover, based on the theory of moral sentiments, the sympathetic process, the process by which a spectator imagines oneness with an actor, is a component of, and sometimes even identical to, reasoning. Accordingly, argumentative writing performance would also require EI in terms of sympathy and empathy (Weinstein, 2003).

In fact, in expository writing, due to its impersonal and objective nature, EI is logically expected to have no relationship, or a much lower correlation than argumentative writing. That could be the reason of the lack of significant relationship between the more-proficient group's EI and their expository test mean scores. In other words, in expository performance, L2 learners were generally supposed to describe or explain what was seen as a third person. Indeed, this would consequently involve less emotional load and lower EI.

REFERENCES

Albert, Reed 2008 = D. H. Albert, J. Reed, *What really matters: A conversation between David H. Albert and Joyce Reed*, from http://www. Lifelearningmagazine.com/0804/ MarApr08.pdf

Armstrong 2001 = T. Armstrong, *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*, Alexandria, VA, ASCD, 2001.

Auerbach 1999 = E. R. Auerbach, *The power of writing, the writing of power: Approaches to adult ESOL writing instruction,* in „Focus on Basics", 3, nr. 4, pp. 1–6.

Bar-On 1997 = R. Bar-On, *Bar-On emotional quotient inventory: User's manual*, Toronto, Multi-Health Systems, 1997.

Bar-On 2000 = R. Bar-On, *Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory*, in Bar-On, Parker (eds.), pp. 363–388.

Bar-On, Parker (eds.) 2000 = R. Bar-On, D. A. Parker (eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 200.

Bolton 2007 = S. Bolton, *No argument! Language and logic in Indonesian EAP student writing.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Manchester University, 2007.

Brackett, Mayer 2003 = M. A. Brackett, J. D. Mayer, *Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence*, in „Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin", 29, 2003, pp. 1147–1158.

Caruso 2004 = D. R. Caruso, *The emotionally intelligent manager: How to develop and use the four key emotional skills of leadership*, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Clapham 1996 = C. Clapham, *The development of IELTS: A study of the effect of background knowledge on reading comprehension*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Connor 1987 = U. Connor, *Research frontiers in writing analysis*, in „TESOL Quarterly", 21, 1987, no. 4, pp. 677–696.

Donovan, Meclell (eds.) 1980 = T. Donovan, B. Meclell, *Eight approaches to teaching composition*, Urbana, IL, National Council of Teachers of English, 1980.

Elsegood, Rahimi 2009 = S. Elsegood, A. Rahimi, *Using computer supported reasoning mapping to teach EFL learners critical reasoning and academic writing*, in „AsiaCall Online Journal", 4, 2009, no. 1, pp. 11–14.

Epstain 1998 = S. Epstain, *Constructive thinking: The key to emotional intelligence*, Westport, CT, Praeger, 1998.

Fagan 2000 = J. F. Fagan, *A theory of intelligence as processing: Implications for society*, in „Psychology, Public Policy, and Law", 6, pp. 168–179.

Fasheh 2002 = M. Fasheh, *How to eradicate illiteracy without eradicating illiterates*. Paper presented at UNESCO roundtable on Literacy as Freedom, Paris, UNESCO, France, 2002.

Flower 2000 = L. Flower, *A cognitive process theory of writing*, in „College Composition and Communication", 32, 2000, no. 2, pp. 365–387.

Gardner 1993 = H. Gardner, *Intelligence and intelligences: Universal principles and individual differences*, in „Archives de Psychologie", 61, 1993, pp. 169–172.

Gardner 1995 = H. Gardner, *Multiple intelligences as a catalyst*, in „English Journal", 30, 1995, no. 8, pp. 16–18.

Goleman 1995 = D. Goleman, *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*, New York, Bantam Books, 1995.

Goleman 1998 = D. Goleman, *Working with emotional intelligence*, New York, Bantam Books, 1998.

Hairston 1982 = M. Hairston, *The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing*, în „College Composition and Communication", 33 1982, nr. 1, pp. 76–78.

Harmer 2002 = J. Harmer, *The practice of English language teaching*, London, Longman, 2002.

Heacox 2002 = D. Heacox, *Differentiating instruction in the regular classroom: How to reach and teach all learners, grades 3–12*, Minneapolis, MN, Free Spirit Pub., 2002.

Holmes 2001 = N. Holmes, *The use of process-oriented approach to facilitate the planning and production of writing for adult students of English as a foreign language*, from www. developingteachers.com/articles_ tchtraining/processw1_nicola.htm

Hutchinson, Waters 1995 = T. Hutchinson, A. Waters, *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Hyland 2003 = K. Hyland, *Second language writing*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Jaworowska, Matczak 2001 = A. Jaworowska, A. Matczak, *Emotional intelligence questionnaire*, Warsaw, Polish Psychological Association, 2001.

Krashen 1981 = S. D. Krashen, *Second language acquisition and second language learning*, Oxford, Pergamon Press, 1981.

Kress 1995 = G. Kress, *Writing the future: English and the making of a culture of innovation*, Sheffield, England, National Association for the Teaching of English, 1995.

Kroll (ed.) 1990 = B. Kroll (ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Landy 2005 = F. J. Landy, *Some historical and scientific issues related to research on emotional intelligence*, in „Journal of Organizational Behavior", 26, 2005, pp. 411–424.

Langan 2001 = J. Langan, *College writing skills with readings*, Singapore, McGraw-Hill Inc., 2001.

Locke 2005, E. A. Locke, *Why emotional intelligence is an invalid concept*, in „Journal of Organizational Behavior", 26, 2005, pp. 425–431, .

Mayer *et alii* 2008 = J. D. Mayer, P. Salovey, D. R. Caruso, *Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits*, in „American Psychologist", 63, 2008, no. 6, pp. 503–517.

Mayer, Salovey 1997 = J. D. Mayer, P. Salovey, *What is emotional intelligence?*, in Salovey, Sluyter (eds.) 1997, pp. 3–31.

Mayer *et alii* 2000 = J. D. Mayer, P. Salovey, D. Caruso, *Emotional intelligence as Zeitgeist, as personality, and as mental ability*, in Bar-On, Parker (eds.) 2000, pp. 92–117.

Mitchell, Myles 2001 = M. Mitchell, J. Myles, *Research design explained*, Fort Worth, Texas: paper presented at the 3rd Annual Positive Psychology Summit, Washington, D.C. 2001.

Moran *et alii* 2006 = S. Moran, M. Kornhaber, H. Gardner, *Orchestrating multiple intelligences*, in „Educational Leadership", 64, 2006, no. 1, pp. 22–27.

Murray 1980 = D. M. Murray, *Writing as process: How writing finds its approach meaning*, in Donovan, Meclell (eds.) 1980, pp. 3–20.

Nolen 2003 = J. L. Nolen, *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*, in „Education", 124, 2003, no. 1, pp. 115–130.
Oginska-Bulik 2005 = N. Oginska-Bulik, *Emotional intelligence in the workplace: Exploring its effects on occupational stress and health outcomes in human service workers*, in „International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health", 18, 2005, no. 2, pp. 167–175.
Payne 1985 = W. L. Payne, *A study of emotion: Developing emotional intelligence, self-integration; relating to fear, pain and desire*, in „Dissertation Abstracts International", 47, 1985, p. 203.
Pishghadam 2009 = R. Pishghadam, *Emotional and verbal intelligences in language learning*, in „Iranian Journal of Language Studies", 3, 2009, no. 1, pp. 43–64.
Poole 2000 = G. T. Poole, *Application of the theory of multiple intelligences to second language learners in classroom situations.* Speech at the National Association of African American Studies & National Association of Hispanic and Latino Studies, 2000, Literature Monograph Series 21–26 February 2000, Houston.
Raime 1985 = A. Raime, *What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing*, in „TESOL Quarterly", 19, 1985, no. 3), pp. 229–258.
Rouhani 2007 = A. Rouhani, *An investigation into emotional intelligence, foreign language anxiety and empathy through a cognitive-affective course in an EFL context*, 2007, from http://www.linguistik-online.com/34_08/rouhani.pdf
Salovey, Mayer 1990 = P. Salovey, J. D. Mayer, *Emotional intelligence, imagination, cognition, and personality*, in 9, 1990, pp. 195–211.
Salovey, Sluyter (eds.) 1997 = P. Salovey, D. Sluyter (eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational applications*, New York, New York Books, 1997.
Schutte *et alii* 1998 = N. S. Schutte, E. Schuetplez, J. M. Malouff, *Emotional intelligence and task performance*, in „Imagination, Cognition and Personality", 20, 1998, no. 3, pp. 347–354.
Shore 2004 = J. R. Shore, *Teacher education and multiple intelligences: A case study of multiple intelligences and teacher efficacy in two teacher preparation courses*, in „Teachers College Record", 106, 2004, no. 1, pp. 112–139.
Silva 1990 = T. Silva, *Second language composition instruction: Development issues and directions in ESL*, in Kroll (ed.) 1990, pp.11–23.
Sternberg, Smith 1986 = R. J. Sternberg, C. Smith, *Social intelligence and decoding skills in nonverbal communication*, in „Social Cognition", 3, 1986, pp. 168–192.
Sternberg 1997 = R. J. Sternberg, *The concept of intelligence and its role in lifelong learning and success*, in „American Psychologist", 52, 1997, pp. 1030–1037.
Tynjala 2001 = P. Tynjala, *Writing, learning and the development of expertise in higher education*, in Tynjala *et alii* (eds.) 2001, pp. 37–56.
Tynjala *et alii* (eds.) 2001 = P. Tynjala *et alii* (eds.), *Writing as a learning tool for constructive learning. Integrating theory and practice*, Amsterdam, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
Weisinger 1998 = H. Weisinger, *Emotional intelligence at work*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1998.
Weinstein 2003 = J. Weinstein, *On Adam Smith*, Belmont, Wadsworth Publishing Company, 2003.
Wright 2006 = R. E. Wright, *Student evaluations of faculty: Concerns raised in the literature, and possible solutions*, in „College Student Journal", 40, 2006, no. 2, pp. 417–22.
Zamel 1987 = V. Zamel, *Writing: The process of discovering meaning*, in „TESOL Quarterly", 16, 1987, no. 3, pp. 195–207.

Abstract

Research shows that L2 learners with higher Emotional Intelligence (EI), referring to their ability to manage their emotions, are capable of making better decisions, communicating more effectively, and experiencing less stress (Caruso 2004; Mayer *et alii* 2000; Pishghadam 2009). The aim of this study was to determine how the productive skills of L2 learning would require EI. More particularly, the focus was on writing skill, as it is such a productive skill that is more objectively and

reliably measurable. The participants included 92 male and female B.A. students of English Literature at University of Mazandaran, aged 19–25. They took the OPT made by Allan (1992), based on which they were distributed into two groups. They also took an EI test (SSEIT) developed by Schutte *et alii* 1998. Moreover, each participant wrote an expository and an argumentative essay; rated based on the Multiple-Trait scoring scheme developed by Hyland (2003). Eventually, the statistical analysis by SPSS showed that more-proficient group was more emotionally intelligent, and the other way around. The correlation coefficient between the less-proficient group's EI and their expository writing analyzed by Pearson Correlation by SPSS showed a moderate correlation between them (r = 0.49, n = 48, α = 0.01). As for the relationship between more-proficient group's EI and their expository writing scores, there was no significant relationship seen between them (r = 0.14, n = 44). Furthermore, there was a moderate correlation (r = 0.47, n = 48, α = 0.01) between the less-proficient group's EI and their argumentative writing scores. Finally, there was a moderate correlation between the more-proficient group's EI and their argumentative writing scores (r = 0.41, n = 44, α = 0.01). The conclusion of the results indicated that since EI has to do with emotions, performance in those areas of L2 that require negotiation of emotions, as in argumentative writing, involved EI. On the other hand, in expository writing, due to its impersonal and objective nature, EI was of no significant relationship, or a much lower correlation than argumentative writing. The findings imply that understanding and managing their own emotions and being aware of and responsive to others' emotions would contribute to the L2 productive skills, particularly writing, as well as motivation and self-actualization of both university professors of L2 writing and their students. Future research may be conducted regarding the effects of gender or cultural background on L2 learners' EI.

Keywords: *Emotional Intelligence, productive skills, multiple intelligences, argumentative writing, expository writing*.

Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University
Department of Linguistics and ELT
Sari, Iran
GilarKarimi@yahoo.com